

“And do a Grizzly”:

Djuna Barnes and dancing animals in the New York press.

Alex Goody

“Out in San Francisco where the weather’s fair
They have a dance out there,
They call the ‘Grizzly Bear’
All your other lovin’ dances don’t compare,
Not so cooney[sic],
But a little more than spooney,
Talk about yo’ bears that Teddy Roosevelt shot,
They couldn’t class with what
Old San Francisco’s got
Listen my honey, do
And I will show to you
The dance of the Grizzly Bear.”¹

In this 1910 composition Irving Berlin celebrates the “Grizzly Bear,” an incredibly popular ragtime dance of the period. The “Grizzly Bear” was the very opposite of graceful social dances such as the waltz. The dynamic was clumsy and rough. Partners slumped their upper torso in side-leans with their hands claw-like and arms hugging closely, whilst stepping heavily from side to side. Along with other “animal” dances such as the “Bunny Hug” and “Turkey Trot,” it sparked the social dance craze that swept the US in the 1910s. Bear dancing, the performing animal act that forces bears to mimic dancing and other human

gestures, has a global history of abuse and exploitation, but this anthropomorphised figure accrues a particular resonance in the dance cultures of the early twentieth century.² As Berlin's number intimates, the ragtime animal dances were supposed to originate from the honky-tonks and dance halls of early-twentieth-century San Francisco, and their raucous and suggestive physicality – what Berlin describes as “a little more than spooney” – outraged Progressive-era morality.³ Danielle Robinson highlights that the animal dances were manifestations of earlier “secular African American plantation and jook house dances,”⁴ and the racial epithet in Berlin's lyrics gestures towards this connection to African American vernacular culture. Moreover, in the “not so” Black grizzly bear, as the lyrics put it, this song rehearses the process whereby the African American origins of ragtime dance and music were elided in their co-option into mainstream Euro-American popular culture. The morally and socially disruptive dynamics of the animal dances, that encouraged young Americans to move in unrestrained, physical ways, were widely decried on the pages of the *New York Times* and other newspapers and periodicals.⁵ The subsequent mainstreaming of ragtime dance by white performance dancers such as Vernon and Irene Castle never fully erased the cultural anxieties, stemming from an intermingling of Progressive-era evolutionary science and racist stereotypes, that these animal dance forms generated.⁶

The periodical texts I explore in this article illustrate how animal dances such as the “Grizzly Bear” unsettled the partition of culture from nature and disturbed the moral policing of Progressive-Era whiteness; such social dancing pointed to the presence of the creatural in the human and to the unstable boundary between humankind and other animals. This is a boundary that the vertical cosmogony of a Progressive-era moral universe, with its rhetoric of social responsibility, improvement and uplift strove hard to maintain. Newspapers and other periodicals were central to the promulgation of this rhetoric, part of the newly-

defined role for an American journalism no longer dominated by political partisanship. Frank Kane, head of the journalism department at the University of Washington, gave voice to this changing conception of newspapers in the 1910s, seeing them “as an institution for social service” and “a force for the spiritual and material betterment of society.”⁷ Early twentieth-century newspapers in America were, of course, in the business of selling news so the “affirmative belief of Progressive Era journalists” in their democratic social and moral role, co-existed with the development of media and publishing technologies that produced new modes of advertising and entertainment.⁸ Nevertheless, for Bruce Evensen the journalism of this era was deeply motivated by the “conviction that America’s democratic experiment was rooted in the dignity of men and women as God-breathed creatures.”⁹

Djuna Barnes’s modernist writing offers a distinctive response to the hierarchies of the Progressive Era and its privileging of the “God-breathed” human citizen; her work has also featured centrally in the emergence of modernist animal studies.¹⁰ My specific intervention in this article is to read Barnes’s early journalism at the intersection of periodical studies, modernist studies and animal studies. Barnes’s journalism, as Sophie Oliver points out, “has engendered a significant body of materialist criticism” and has provided fruitful ground for academic examinations of embodiment, sexuality, fashion, performativity and popular culture in her writing.¹¹ However, as Oliver also indicates, “much work remains to be done.”¹² Despite decades of academic publications on Barnes’s journalism and other overlooked parts of her oeuvre (her drama and short stories for example), *Nightwood* continues to cast a long shadow over Barnes Studies, often obscuring the significant formal and thematic innovations of her early writing. I have argued elsewhere that “writing in the New York press gave Barnes a space to develop her distinctive version of modernist textuality within the frames of the published page.”¹³ Here my focus is on Barnes’s reportage on the popular cultures of 1910s New York, and in the following pages I argue that her writing forges a connection

between the animal dances and the “eruption of animality in artistic and cultural texts” that Carrie Rohman and others have traced in literary modernism.¹⁴ Responses to and accounts of the “Grizzly Bear” in the popular press demonstrate, in a literal way, how social dance in the 1910s illustrates the account of modern and contemporary dance as “an especially creaturely mode of becoming” that Rohman advances in her 2018 study *Choreographies of the Living*.¹⁵ The ragtime animal dances of the period exemplify Rohman’s account of the “visceral nature of dance as it foregrounds the somatic and ‘inhuman’ in a uniquely intensified manner,” and the periodical coverage of animals dances manifests a preoccupation with nonhuman forms that resonate with modernism and specifically with Barnes’s writing.¹⁶ The assemblages of bears and other dancing (human and nonhuman) animals that I trace across the pages of modern periodicals in this article reveal the productive intersection of modernist animal figurations with the elusive histories of social dance.

Barnes, New York and Dance

Barnes embarked as a writer, for the *Brooklyn Daily Eagle*, in 1913 at the upswing of the dance craze in the US, and she was a staff writer at the *New York Press* between December 1913 and May 1915. Within the same period Barnes also wrote four pieces for Joseph Pulitzer’s *New York World Sunday Magazine*.¹⁷ The *Eagle*, a key arbiter of Brooklyn civic pride, addressed an aspirant middle-class readership, advancing a reformist agenda and a generally Progressivist ethos. The *New York Press*, that had been staunchly resistant to yellow journalism (the term was first used in print by the *New York Press* editor Ervin Warman), was purchased by Frank Munsey in 1912; as I discuss in “Djuna Barnes on the Page” Barnes’s distinctive journalistic voice became a marketable asset for this newspaper, and her association with the *Press* meant she published stories and poetry in other Munsey

publications.¹⁸ Reporting on Brooklyn culture, urban politics and city spaces; covering popular culture for serious newsreaders of the *Press*; writing sensational “stunt” journalism for the *New York World*; Barnes wrote in and through the competing modes of Progressive-era reportage. Katherine Biers suggests there is “a compelling tension between the commercial function of Barnes’s journalism and its reformist bent,” while Justin Edwards identifies a “duplicity” in the approach and voice of Barnes’s urban journalism.¹⁹ In contrast to these accounts of tension and duplicity, I argue that the wry tone, ambiguity and extravagances of Barnes’s journalistic voice are authorial strategies of subversion linked to her (re-)presentation of reformist ontologies which, together, serve to countervoice dominant narratives of the (moral, social and cultural) uplift of the human citizen.

Dance in a variety of forms appears in Barnes’s New York writing, in the features, interviews, stories, poems and plays that she published in periodicals between 1913 and 1922 and her writing on dance exemplifies how she uses the attractions of spectacular and participatory popular culture to disorder the hierarchies and mores of reform. Barnes’s writing moves from roof-top dance floors to tango tearooms, from Flo Ziegfeld’s chorus line dancers to Valentine de Saint-Point’s “Métachorie,” from Joan Sawyer to an anonymous Vaudeville dancer.²⁰ Barnes’s account of dance and dancers are simultaneously concerned with the embodied realities of dancing and with the translation of dance into cultural meaning and commodified practice. Reflecting on interview pieces on dancers Mimi Aguglia and Gaby Deslys, Margaret Bocking points out that Barnes “critiques representations of these performers as dangerously erotic.”²¹ In the *New York Press* piece “The Wild Aguglia and Her Monkeys,” where Barnes interviews Mimi Aguglia (who was appearing in an Italian translation of Oscar Wilde’s *Salomé* at the Broadway Comedy Theatre), it is the creatural, rather than the erotic, that Barnes underscores, and Aguglia’s corporeality communicates an

animal proximity. Barnes emphasises the dancer's physical effort, the "lunge and spasms of her dancing," rather than the display of Salome's dance, and makes a pointed connection between Aguglia and the "company's monkeys" whom she clasps in an embrace before going on stage.²² At the end of Aguglia's performance Barnes records merely "the soft sound of a woman's body threshing the inevitable, and—back to the monkeys again."²³ The "threshing" body, made reflex and creatural in Barnes's word choice, iterates a return ("back" "again") to her companion species. Demonstrating this final moment, one of the three article illustrations by Barnes presents Aguglia lying on her back with a monkey on each upheld hand (fig. 1).

<insert Figure 1 here, half page, black and white; Djuna Barnes, *Back to the Monkeys Again*, illustration for "The Wild Aguglia and Her Monkeys." *New York Press*, December 28, 1913 section 5, p.2.>

Nancy Bombaci misreads this finale, wrongly allying Barnes with the humanist ontologies of the Progressive Era by arguing "Aguglia is a freak of both race and gender, and in her bestiality and pre-verbal expressiveness, she embodies a 'primitive' and non-rational state of being that both fascinates and frightens Barnes."²⁴ Barnes does not endorse these dualities and assumptions, she deranges them. Moreover, the productive contiguity of a "palpable" "elemental" dance body to animal performers in Barnes's "The Wild Aguglia and Her Monkeys" illustrates the constitutive encounters I explore in this article, ones that resonate both through 1910s social dance and through Barnes's modernism.²⁵

Some of Barnes's early pieces in the *Eagle* concern social dance and the moral concerns about ragtime-inspired animal forms, and the approach Barnes adopts illustrates her wryly resistant take on the Progressivist ethos of the paper and of early-twentieth-century America. Her first article, "You Can Tango—a Little—At Arcadia Dance Hall," follows the upper-class "Reginald Delancy" to the Arcadia dancehall in the heart of Brooklyn. Warned of the

“taboo” on animal dances, he nonetheless enjoys himself dancing with the shop-girl Delia, noticing that the dancing here is “far more polite and graceful than that done on the previous evening at a fashionable society dance by girls of Reggie’s own sort.”²⁶ In “The Tingling, Tangling Tango as ‘Tis Tripped at Coney Isle” Barnes concludes that the Coney Island has passed that “a few years ago tolerated nearly any kind of dancing,” whilst simultaneously revealing the sexual commerce surrounding the professional “Spielers;” single men employed to dance with unpartnered women.²⁷ Most telling is the inset paragraph, “How to Dance at the Arcadia,” in the original publication of “You Can Tango—A Little—At Arcadia Dance Hall,” that interjects into Barnes’s article a set of direct moral instructions for social dancing:

When you are dancing it should be a silent expression of courtesy, and not a series of unseemly movements without order or taste.

The mental effect of dancing should be a feeling of gentleness and respect, and not of coarseness. [. . .]

Let your intelligence, goodness and politeness be known by your movements.²⁸

The dynamics negotiated here, of bourgeoisie respectability (“courtesy,” “order,” “taste,” “gentleness,” “respect”) against the sexual danger posed by “unseemly movements” and “coarseness” in dancing point out to a wider ontology that values a “mental” control and “intelligence” over “movements” and the affective “feeling” body. The “correctness of mind” that the “How to” instructions dictate try, against the distractions of Barnes’s humour, to counter the possibility that this affective movement-body might draw the dancer into sexualized, uncivilized, and even nonhuman, proximities.²⁹ It is the assemblage of bodies, desire, dance, animals and movement that these instructions disavow, and that Barnes would

later return to, that marks the “Grizzly Bear’s” notoriety in the evolution of modern social dance.

Doing the Grizzly Bear

The “Grizzly Bear” hit Broadway in 1910 when Fanny Brice introduced it into her debut season with the Ziegfeld Follies.³⁰ It was still a popular, and infamous, dance three years later; in Nat M. Wills’s musical number for the Ziegfeld Follies 1913 season, “New York, What’s the Matter with You,” the “Grizzly Bear” represents the social dance forms that were being suppressed by the NYC authority’s one a.m. curfew for dancing. Wills laments “I can’t shuffle and ruffle anymore,” and concludes with an innuendo that draws attention to the erotic energy of the dance:

Farewell you cabaret life;
 Now I’ve got to go home when the curfew rings
 And do a grizzly,
 And do a grizzly,
 And do a grizzly with my wife!³¹

The “Grizzly Bear,” and its association with physical sexuality, also features in the refrain of Dave Stamper and Gene Buck’s “Shakespearian Rag” (1912):

Romeo loved his Juliet,
 And they were some lovers, you can bet, and yet,
 I know that if they were here to-day,
 They’d Grizzly Bear in a different way.

It thereby finds its way into the marginalia of *The Waste Land's* intertextual references to ragtime in “The Game of Chess,” only subsequently to be deployed in Bloomsbury by T. S. Eliot himself, as a token of his native competence in vernacular dance culture.³² In June 1927 Eliot writes to Virginia Woolf that he is “free for tea on Wednesday or Thursday or for dinner on Wednesday” and that “if any of those times suited you I should be very glad to show you what little I know about the Grizzly Bear, or Chicken Strut.”³³ The “Grizzly Bear” travels all the way to the contemporary BBC costume drama *Downton Abbey* in a scene (in Season One, Episode Two) where the footman Thomas Barrow teaches Daisy, the kitchen maid, the dance. In this 2010 evocation of 1912 England the “Grizzly Bear” serves metonymical to represent the disruptive incursions of popular US culture into British society: the below-stairs maid aspires to the fashionable, social-dance leisure pursuits of the middle and upper classes. These popular forms of dance heralded an era of fun and sociability, offering new forms of emancipation and display that crossed class boundaries and foregrounded the “performative dimension of everyday leisure.”³⁴ Thus, Daisy’s “Grizzly Bear” points to the end of the Edwardian era and the reconfiguration of the British social hierarchy that *Downton Abbey* as a series traces.

But tracking the “Grizzly Bear” from early-twentieth-century New York dancehall and vaudeville to twenty-first century BBC costume drama simply allegorizes the nonhuman animal and reinforces an anthropocentrism that refuses any encounter with the corporeal ontology of the dancing bear. “Modernism’s allegorical animals,” as Cari Hovanec observes, often “ignore the specificity and diversity of actual animals.”³⁵ A trajectory that resists reading bear dancing/dancing bears just in a metaphorical or allegorical mode must pay attention to their lived specificity and radical alterity, and acknowledge their physical and

figurative co-option by modernity. One place to begin this is the pages of contemporary newspapers. So, for example, at the same time that New York couples were lumbering, swaying and hugging in dance-halls, cabarets and private parties, Grizzly Bears, who had always been the sport of game hunters, were being driven from their habitat in places like the Cascade Mountains and hunted down when they became a “menace to stock.”³⁶ Or else, a Christmas shopper in 1912 might encounter consonant versions of the Grizzly Bear transmuted into consumerist object, visiting Henry Siegel’s 14th-Street New York store on a Saturday to see a free “Animal Show” of “lions, lionesses, grizzly bears, panthers, zebras, kangaroos, lemurs, monkeys and birds,” before browsing the “Fur Floor Rugs of Polar and Grizzly Bear, Leopard, Lion, Tiger and Zebra Skins” at B. Altman & Co. (Fifth Avenue).³⁷

Animal shows (including zoos, circuses, vaudeville) in the early-twentieth-century US remediated nonhuman animals, who were rapidly disappearing from the environment and from daily life, for a human audience. John Berger’s point about the role of the zoo where humans “go to meet animals, to observe them, to see them” being, in fact, a “a living monument to their disappearance” pertains directly to these other animal spectacles.³⁸ But here the “disappointment” and boredom of the zoo,³⁹ is replaced by a spectacle that is both synthetically nostalgic and brutally exploitative; the performing animals “reminded audiences of a pre-industrial state of nature, even as [they] were expected to conform to modern conditions of theatrical production and were coerced to mimic human behaviours.”⁴⁰ As the Siegel Store advertisement illustrates, also, the animal shows were bound up with the functioning of consumer capitalism and the spectacular cultures of modernity. The assemblages of bear, human, capital, commodity, environment and leisure that appear in early-twentieth-century New York periodicals highlight the multiple valences of nonhuman animals at this juncture of modernity. They also demonstrate that the animal forms and

references paraded across the pages of the periodical press for an urban readership increasingly disconnected from the lived reality of nonhuman animals were themselves a remediation and reshaping of the semiotics of the animal and its functional role in capitalism.

Thus, the Grizzly Bear (as animal other, as dance, and as rug) exemplifies what Nicole Shukin points to as “the semiotic currency of animal signs *and* the carnal traffic in animal substances,” that is, to the role of the nonhuman animal in the material and symbolic circulation of capital.⁴¹ Shukin begins her study of *Animal Capital* with the beaver, Canada’s official emblem, highlighting “the economic and symbolic capital accumulated in the sign of the beaver,” that is “deployed as a tool of affective governance” and presented as “a natural, self-evident sign of the nation.”⁴² This beaver-emblem “advantageously *forgets* . . . the cultural and ecological genocides of the settler-colonial nation form” and the Grizzly Bear, as the state symbol of California (the bear flag was adopted as the California State Flag in 1911), performs a similar function.⁴³ The Grizzly Bear thrived in California, before humans settled the area, but had been hunted to extinction by 1922; Monarch the Grizzly Bear, who was the model for the 1911 bear flag, was caught for William Randolph Hearst in a publicity stunt in 1889 and kept in a zoo in San Francisco until his death in 1911, when he was taxidermied and exhibited at the Academy of Sciences at Golden Gate Park.⁴⁴ As humans on Terrific Street in San Francisco were improvising dance moves that performed the physicality of the Grizzly Bear, the bears themselves were rapidly disappearing from the Californian environment under the incursions and extractive practices of settler colonialism.

The dancing bear can also be approached through Performance Studies that holds in its purview a “broad spectrum,” spanning from ritual to the performance arts, sport to performances of everyday life.⁴⁵ Although the field may be predominantly predicated upon

the notion of the *homo performans*, recent animal-oriented Performance Studies proposes ways to exceed this “reductive account of performance.”⁴⁶ Laura Cull, for example, cites the possibility of human/nonhuman animal performance that “may not be geared towards the production of *knowledge* about animals at all, so much as an embodied proximity to animals’ own ways of thinking and performing that remains resistant to any attempted paraphrase into discourse.”⁴⁷ The “Grizzly Bear” was, obviously, not devised as a nonanthropocentric, embodied epistemology but, considering the zooësis of this bear dance – its manifestation and the cultural responses to it – is a productive way of thinking about the embodied proximities of the animal dances.⁴⁸ Such an orientation in Performance Studies also enables us to move beyond the anthropocentric focus on performativity, or indeed “performative writing” that has characterised much work on Barnes’s journalism.⁴⁹ Mimi Aguglia’s return (“back”, “again”) to her companion species co-performers that Barnes singles out, is an embodied movement towards human-animal proximity.⁵⁰ Barnes’s “crawl[ing] after” Dinah a gorilla in her cage in the Bronx Zoo is another version.⁵¹ In this 1914 *New York World Magazine* article, woman reporter and “Gorilla woman” share in a performativity femininity that Barnes ventriloquises for Dinah, but also embodies in her expressive, embodied encounter with the performative animality of a young zoo animal exposed to a “crowd” of onlookers.⁵² What is at stake here is *anthroperformance*, that is, that the incompleteness of the project of *being* human comes to the fore when such non-discursive proximities are enacted; social-dance animal forms, in which bodily animality is encountered, expressed and shared in a space of participatory performance, enact a similar de-anthropomorphic trajectory.⁵³

The popularity of the “Grizzly Bear” dance, and its animal companions, emerged at the moment when social dancing in America was undergoing the “revolution” that Barnes’s

journalism records.⁵⁴ At the beginning of the twentieth century more formal nineteenth-century ballroom dances such as the cotillion gave way to “looser, more physically expressive” social dancing whose new movement vocabulary and “heightened awareness of the body” was influenced by musical developments such as ragtime.⁵⁵ Ragtime dances were a hybrid of Black American movement aesthetics and the partnered walking forms of white Euro-American social dance. In Danielle Robinson’s words, these dances “embodied an aesthetic play, angularity, casualness, inventiveness, and abruptness,” “encouraged dancers to use their entire body – by mobilizing their shoulders and hips and animating their faces and limbs,” and “freed the torso and limbs to express sexual pleasure and desire.”⁵⁶ The physical expressions, and new proximities and encounters, of modern social dancing provoked a powerful reaction in the moral gatekeepers of Progressive-era America, a reaction that coalesced in response to the unruly and erotic physicality of the animal dances.⁵⁷ That the animal dances might, quite literally, deform, or even de-evolve the human body, leading to “freak” manifestations of human animality was also a matter of public concern.⁵⁸ The *New York Press* in June 1912 offers a hyperbolic account of the “effect of the ‘grizzly bear dance’ on the Chicago girl:”

Hunted look, lumbering walk, drooping the hands like paws, rapid growth of the finger nails, abnormal development of the muscles of the lower limbs, savage temper, growling voices, sleepiness in the wintertime, fondness for hugging. The foregoing are held out as the effects of freak dancing on the Chicago girl. Nor is this all, for it is asserted that the ‘grizzly bear face’ is a natural penalty for overindulgence by young girls in this pastime.⁵⁹

The young girl suffering from this Grizzly Bear “effect” will, apparently, transfigure into beastly form both somatically (“paws,” “nails,” “limbs,” “face”) and in disposition, resulting in a “savage” deformation of mood, and a morally dubious penchant for “hugging.” However ironic the tone is here, the hyperbole of this article is not exceptional in newspapers of the time, where moral and physical injury, or even death, from animal dancing was reported in the press.

American anxieties about the detrimental effect of animal dances on both the working classes and the youth of the upper and middle classes produced a twofold approach. On one hand, organisations like the “Committee on Amusement Resources for Working Girls” (spoofed by Barnes as the “Social Centers Corporation” in “You Can Tango—a Little—At Arcadia Dance Hall”) focused efforts in 1912 on “form[ing] classes in the right sort of dancing” that would be “be jolly, but neither ugly nor vulgar.”⁶⁰ The Committee went on to sponsor “two unique dance halls” that would offer “wholesome forms of entertainment for young people.”⁶¹ Parallel to these reforms (aimed primarily at working women), were the responses from the bourgeoisie, anxious about the improper effects on the youth of “fashionable society” (something Barnes’s Reggie Delancy observes).⁶² The resulting attempts to “ban” the animal dances from society events met with a casual defiance. Thus, as the *New York Times* reports, a “Movement Begins to Bar ‘Turkey Trot’ and ‘Grizzly Bear’ from Fifth Avenue” in early January 1912, but at the end of that month the dancers in the Rubinstein Club at the Waldorf simply disregard that fact that the “‘turkey trot’ [was] condemned along with the ‘grizzly bear,’” and choose instead to “practice in the corridors and halls off the ballroom itself.”⁶³ It was with the rise of popular white exhibition dancers that these proscribed dances were mainstreamed, sanitized and distanced from the animal proximities and Black origins that made them anathema to white bourgeoisie America.⁶⁴

Irene Castle's Bear Dance

The trajectory of dancers Vernon and Irene Castle, whom Barnes interviewed for the *New York Press* in early 1914, exemplifies how the animal energies of ragtime were translated into respectable, white social-dance forms for Progressive-era America.⁶⁵ The newly-married couple began their careers in a Paris review show in early 1912 where they improvised a American dance routine to the tune of “Alexander’s Ragtime band” and “followed this with a sort of grizzly bear dance.”⁶⁶ It was their interpretation of rag dances like the “Grizzly Bear” that brought them to notice, and with Elisabeth Marbury as their agent – facilitating their introduction to society figures, negotiating their substantial remunerations for private appearances, and fostering their celebrity as exhibition dancers – they rose to pre-eminence in New York.⁶⁷ The Castles operated their own combination club-and-dancing school from 1913 to 1916 (the Castle House, on the corner of Madison Avenue), and ran other clubs and dance halls (the *San Souci*, *Castles in the Air*, and *Castles by the Sea* at Luna Park), appeared in films (such as the autobiographical *The Whirl of Life*, 1915), and issued a popular, illustrated dancing manual; *Modern Dancing* (1915).⁶⁸ They also went on tour twice in 1914 and continued their Broadway career together until Vernon Castle (as a British Citizen) joined the Royal Flying Corps in January 1916. Irene quickly became a style icon and most popular histories record Irene Castle as the origin of the bob hair cut that became one of the ubiquitous markers of the Flapper’s rejection of nineteenth-century ideals of demure feminine embodiment.⁶⁹ The Castles’s success, like that of other exhibition dancers, was dependent on a careful negotiation of fashion and bourgeois respectability, that could be read by audiences of different classes, and an “association with high society and cultivated air of ‘refinement’ and grace,” alongside their ability to perform a whiteness that separated their modern social dance from its Black American origins.⁷⁰

In their public personas the Castles epitomised Progressive-era notions of domestic harmony, physical health and wholesome pleasure, and in their dance they cleaned-up the popular forms that had brought them to public prominence.⁷¹ Moving on from the animal dances, the Castles innovated their own ragtime partnered dances such as the “Castle Walk.” Their dancing posture was centred on a neutral pelvis, very different from the kinaesthetics of vernacular ragtime dance; their dance forms replaced the animated ragtime “movements of the whole body, especially the buttocks and shoulders” and “vertical axis dips, sequential rolls through the torso,” with controlled limb movements and little space for improvisation.⁷² Thus, as Danielle Robinson describes, their “commodification and racialization” of social dance “removed ragtime’s references to blackness by eradicating its exuberant physicality and sexuality.”⁷³ But the Castles did have a productive working relationship and friendship with the African American composer and bandleader James Reese Europe; with his patronage they were able to visit Harlem nightclubs and dance halls in the 1910s that would not otherwise have welcomed them, and they saw Black musical forms and performers as essential to modern social dancing.⁷⁴ Europe and his orchestra travelled with them on their vaudeville tours (with the Castles’s fully-equipped pullman train providing accommodation in segregated towns), and the Castles actively supported Black music in the US. A *New York Evening Post* article from April 1914, for example, promoting a benefit concert for the “National Negro Orchestra” organization that was “recently formed for the purpose of perpetuating the true racial expression in negro music” announces that the Castles will dance along with “a number of coloured performers.”⁷⁵ The Castles’s conversion of ragtime dances for Euro-American consumption was not a simple appropriation of Black and subaltern cultures: they clearly skirted the complex codes of the Progressive Era since their reputation

was shored up by their conventional marriage, Vernon's choreographic and tutoring skill, and Irene's respectable, fashionable femininity.

The deployment of Irene Castle's white femininity to regulate the boundaries of modern social-dance bodies is viscerally enacted in a February 1915 article in the *New York Press*. Appearing in the regular Sunday *Stage* section, Helen Ten Broeck's article "Mrs Vernon Castle's Bear Dance Thrills Debutantes, But Bear Tears Her Gown" offers an account of Irene Castle that has her, literally, doing an animal dance. The article gives an account of Castle performing at a dance party at her home on Lexington Avenue with "Marquis, the biggest and clumsiest bear from the Hippodrome Circus" who "loves to do stunts with Madame Spellman."⁷⁶ The article plays to the deliberate contrast between the cultured Irene and the primitive bear, which is foregrounded in the piece by the central photograph of Irene and a bear (fig. 2).

<insert Figure 2 about here, full page landscape, black and white; "Mrs Vernon Castle's Bear Dance Thrills Debutantes, but Bear Tears Her Gown." *New York Press*, February 7, 1915, section 4, p.4.>

The danger that the bear represents is clear, but Irene Castle's femininity is made of strong-enough stuff to resist any attack:

Marquis registered his protest against the modern dance. With a downward sweep of his freshly manicured paw he tore three long, straight slits in Mrs Castle's velvet skirt [. . .] No harm was done to the pretty dancer, and as she had worn the heavy skirt with just such a contingency in view, she laughed the affair off lightly.⁷⁷

The Progressive-era ideal of the virtuous strength of white, middle-class femininity is encapsulated here, and Irene Castle is offered as a staunch defence against the animal danger that Marquis is used to symbolise. However, there are all sorts of disturbances that creep into this light-hearted piece which serve to push against the vertical ontologies of humanism and move towards an acknowledgement of the zooësis of the bear. Broeck describes Irene and the bear as a “couple,” and reports Alla Nazimova claiming that “Russian bears dance naturally” (an oblique reference to the *Ballets Russes*) and a woman declaring “that Marquis had eyes exactly like [Anna] Pavlowa.”⁷⁸ Marquis the dancing bear stands as a mimic, performing an anthropomorphism that opens up the unstable boundary between human and nonhuman animal existence that the popular animal dances also stage. Marquis both fails in his mimicking (he is neither human nor civilised) and exposes the duality that captures him as Other to the human. In his dancing – “with no less grace than a good many beginners with whom one trots in Fifth avenue drawing rooms” – Marquis traces the creatural energies of the “Grizzly Bear.”⁷⁹

That Broeck’s article may not even be factual testifies further to the boundaries that are unsuccessfully shored up here in the *New York Press*. The Castles lived with many companion species and Irene Castle became a vocal animal rights campaigner from the 1920s onwards. In her autobiographical accounts she records her hatred of the coercive animal performances the Castles encountered in their vaudeville appearances, and registers her horror at “dogs beaten unmercifully,” trainers “holding a powerful hose close” to animals’ noses and “animals shocked with electricity, stuck with needles, and starved except for the few tid-bits [sic] of reward which made them do the things they were afraid to do.”⁸⁰ Whilst in Chicago on a vaudeville tour in 1914 the Castles rescued a performing bear from terrible mistreatment by purchasing it for \$900 and transporting it, between them on the back seat of

a taxi, to Lincoln Park Zoo.⁸¹ Subsequently, “they had a clause inserted in all [their] contracts” against “appear[ing] on the stage with any animal act.”⁸²

Given the Castles’s disquiet about animal performers, their rescue of a performing bear and Irene Castle’s later activism for animal rights, it is clear that the bear dance in their apartment did not actually happen. In fact the fictional feature “Mrs Vernon Castle’s Bear Dance” deploys gendered (and racialised) Progressivist discourse to manufacture publicity both for the Hippodrome and for Irene Castle: the *Midwinter Mammoth Circus Supreme* ran from January to March 1915, and featured Millie Spellman and her troupe of bears on the bill,⁸³ whilst Irene Castle had just returned to the cast of the Broadway production *Watch Your Step* after an unplanned absence.⁸⁴ The photograph of the dancers (bear and woman), and the incident of the bear lunging at Irene Castle, actually derives from the Castles’s Chicago encounter with the bear they then rescued, as related by Irene in her autobiography:

On Wednesday I was asked to stay after the matinee to have my picture taken teaching the bear to dance [. . .] I hated this type of publicity, but had learned to put up with it. [. . .] The Italian, in his short sleeves, led the poor lumbering beast onto the stage with a heavy chain and grunted out a harsh command which obviously meant, “Stand up.” The bear reared off the ground reluctantly and I reached forward to take his paws and point my toe for the cameraman. The flash bulb went off, and the startled bear, with a growl, made a lunge for my hands. I snatched them away just in time and at the same instant his owner came down on his head with a baseball bat, with such a resounding crack that the bear crumpled to the floor.

I hadn't seen the baseball bat or I would never have permitted the pictures to be taken. I was furious at the trainer. I felt no anger at all toward the bear, who naturally resented the whole episode.⁸⁵

The coercion, cruelty and Irene Castle's own awkward complicity in this "publicity" encounter between performers – woman and nonhuman animal – contrasts starkly to the droll anecdote of "Mrs Vernon Castle's Bear Dance." It exposes how Irene Castle's persona of unsullied white femininity is sustained by the actual and semiotic violence of anthropocentrism, the brutal reinforcement of a species boundary in which dancing woman and bear are both caught. Their only liberation is a contingent one, enmeshed as they are in capitalism: Irene Castle's wealth earned from dancing; \$900 for the bear.

Barnes's Bears and Zooësis

Exactly a week later, on exactly the same newspaper pages, Barnes offers her own staging of the dancing bear. On February 14, 1915, Barnes's "Djuna Barnes Probes the Souls of the Jungle Folk at the Hippodrome Circus" was published in the Sunday *Stage* section of the *New York Press* (fig. 3).

<insert Figure 3 about here, full page landscape, black and white; "Djuna Barnes Probes the Souls of the Jungle Folk at the Hippodrome Circus." *New York Press*, February 14, 1915, section 4, p.2>

Like Broeck before her, Barnes's article (ostensibly) publicizes and promotes the Hippodrome's *Midwinter Mammoth Circus Supreme*. But when Barnes writes of Marquis and the other animals dancing at the Hippodrome, she turns directly to the zooësis of the nonhuman performers and reveals their uncertain capture within human structures of intelligibility: "Bears Really Don't Hug" a header tells us, "This was Never Dante's Fate"

Barnes's illustration explains.⁸⁶ The poem which opens the article sets up some of the dynamics of Barnes's piece; "Mrs Vernon Castle's Bear Dance" also opens with a poem. Barnes's poem is written in a regular iambic tetrameter with an abba rhyme scheme, and seems to play reasonably straightforwardly with the anthropomorphism that characterises Rudyard Kipling, for example, and which has a distinctly didactic purpose. But consider the presentation of the bears, who are also foregrounded in Barnes's illustrations:

And down below where blind bears walk
 Or lurch in tears upon a rug—
 It is because they cannot hug,
 It is because they cannot talk.

They are denied all things but weight
 And rug value in days to come;
 No wonder they are stricken dumb,
 For this was never Dante's fate⁸⁷

The bears are first described as "down below" – literally in the underground spaces of the Hippodrome circus where the nonhuman animals were kept – but also "below" the human in an anthropocentric cosmology. They are also "blind," their dumbness, the condition of the animal which places them outside the human realm of language, is not mentioned until near the end of these stanzas. This blindness is metaphorical of course as they can see; instead it signals a symbolic understanding of the animal as lacking in self-knowledge or consciousness, an anthropocentric ontology that the poem is parodying. That the bears are "denied" highlights how that ontology refuses animal existence in its own right, amplified in

the transformation of the “rug” on which the bears can dance into a bear-skin “rug value;” the bears co-opted as *thing* to be used in commodity culture. The bears’ speechlessness is finally related to the humanist struggle between fate and free will, signalled by the reference to Dante. His descent into Hell (down below) is a journey into knowledge and ultimately redemption, the bears are simply waiting to perform for a human audience.

Later in the article Barnes recounts the words of the bear trainer, Mr Spellman (clearly a relation of Millie Spellman):

Mr Spellman, a sort of joke in a high hat, with a sweet sense of humor and a sweeter, more valued sense of truth, was imparting knowledge:

“A bear, you know,” he remarked, “never hugged a person in its life—that’s a statement that some hunter returning from the wilds made to attract attention to his caressable anatomy. Teddy R, made the most of it—we all like to think of it, it is so romantic, so charmingly bourgeoisie.”⁸⁸

Barnes’s irony is very obvious here. Mr Spellman offers the “sweetness” of human knowledge, but that this might also be the charm of “humor” undermines the truth value of his knowledge. What Mr Spellman tells us is a story about the human co-option of the nonhuman animal; the animal as the wild “prey” of the hunter, and the animal as a counter in a human story of moral choice. The reference is to the well-known story of president Roosevelt and his refusal to kill a bear cub caught for him at the end of an unsuccessful hunting trip in 1902. This is also a story about the nonhuman animal turned into consumer commodity as a childhood toy – the teddy bear. Both stories are “charmingly bourgeoisie” in the anthropocentric, Progressivist morals and economics they uphold.

Barnes introduces the bears themselves in an extended scene:

straight across the open space with music of softly lurching flanks, with the deep security of padded feet—still with paws like hands that pray, held up before their charred, black snouts . . . unblinking, cautious even of meditation; shrewd, enormously hypocritical, swaying to an invisible choir.[. . .] There is no rattle of chains now; they are suddenly transported from the animals into the actor. They are part of a system of joy termed the three-ringed circus. [. . .]you are glad, oh, very glad, that you will not have to witness their ability; you have heard so much about their hugging and their general wickedness. You don't know that they can kiss as deftly as any human; you have never held their heads on your lap.⁸⁹

What we see in the bears is their animality (flanks, snouts, paws), but also their possession of attributes of supposedly human awareness; “shrewd,” “cautious.” The religious lexis here (“prayer”, “meditation”) makes for an even starker confusion of human-nonhuman attributes which Barnes does not resolve into a didactic anthropomorphism but, instead, signals directly: they are “enormously hypocritical.” And in their circus act, as dancing bears, they move out of the realm of the nonhuman animal and into an uncertain space, they are freed from their chains (not literally of course) and are carried into (transported into) the space of the “actor.” They are mimicking that which they are not, as the actor mimics that which she is not and, as across the whole of Barnes’s oeuvre, this performativity unsettles any conception of stable, integral, sovereign subjectivity. The circus animals thus possess “the hint of a possible knowledge of those corners of the human mind supposed to be secret.”⁹⁰ Barnes’s circus animals are not entertaining specimens for the gaze of a human audience and they do,

as Laura Winkiel highlights, “mock the hierarchy of humankind over the natural world.”⁹¹

Ultimately, these nonhuman creatures are observers and mimics of a humanity that is always already an iteration and not an inevitability, a humanity that is an *anthroperformance*.

*

Barnes’s work has been significant to the emergent field of modernist animal studies and much attention has been paid to her particular disruptions of the discursive categories of human and nonhuman animal. But what I propose here is that her 1910s Progressive-era journalism engages with the “visceral” becomings of dance, that then play a key role in the development of her creatural modernism.⁹² To recognise that the human is, for Barnes, an anthroperformance sustained (and exposed) by the presumptive coercions towards a fully human presence, re-forms the intersections of performativity, the bodily and becomings-animal that propel her modernism. Anthroperformance, as I am defining it here, provides a new way of thinking through both dance and nonhuman animals in modernism, that is also expressed in the ephemeral corporeal traces of dancing (the) bear. The accounts of the “Grizzly Bear” on the pages of the New York press in the early 1910s expose how the visceral experience of the free interpretation of *doing* the “Grizzly Bear” for couples on the dance floor contradicted the commodified and racialized animal dances of controlled exhibition dance, exemplified by the journalistic reimagining of Irene Castles’s “Bear Dance.”⁹³ And as Barnes’s own dancing bears embody, the “hugging and [. . .] general wickedness” in the free expression of the ragtime animal dances demonstrates that the human never fully divests itself of the somatic and the inhuman.⁹⁴

Thus, Robin in *Nightwood* (1936), “a woman who is beast turning human,” carries the creatural becomings of a dance that is impeded as she is fixed by the desire (and desiring

gaze) of others: “her legs, in white flannel trousers, were spread as in a dance, the thick-lacquered pumps looking too lively for the arrested step.”⁹⁵ When, at the impossible ending of *Nightwood*, Robin goes down with her ex-lover Nora’s dog, where, as Erin Edwards rightly argues, “[t]he dog and Robin occupy positions of physical reciprocity,” Barnes essays a performance of human-nonhuman animal proximity which, to use Cull’s terms, “remains resistant to any attempted paraphrase into discourse.”⁹⁶ When the sinister brothers don animal masks and force their mother Augusta and sister Miranda to “dance” in Act II of *The Antiphon* (1958), they perform the brutal semiotic and literal violence that capitalism and humanism enacts upon the bodies of women, animals, other.⁹⁷ And when, in the knotty drafts of the poetry that occupied Barnes’s last decades, the aged human stoops to “fall, all four feet down,” they stumble into the corporeality of the animal body.⁹⁸ Commencing with her reportage on dancing in New York and moving through variations and versions to the final (posthumous) publication *Creatures in an Alphabet* (1982), Barnes consorts with the creatural and reveals how the correspondence between human and nonhuman animals has been “Mistranslated from the start.”⁹⁹

Bibliography

Barnes, Djuna. “You Can Tango—a Little—At Arcadia Dance Hall.” *Brooklyn Daily Eagle*, June 29, 1913, section II: 22.

Barnes, Djuna. “The Tingling, Tangling Tango as ‘Tis Tripped at Coney Isle.” *Brooklyn Daily Eagle*, August 31, 1913, magazine section: 7

Barnes, Djuna. “The Wild Aguglia and Her Monkeys.” *New York Press*, December 28, 1913 section 5: 2.

Barnes, Djuna. “Yes, the Vernon Castles Really Have a Home and They Occasionally Tango Past It.” *New York Press*, January 18 (1914) section 5: 3.

Barnes, Djuna. “Djuna Barnes Probes the Souls of the Jungle Folk at the Hippodrome Circus.” *New York Press*, February 14, 1915, section 4: 2

Barnes, Djuna. *Nightwood*. London: Faber and Faber, 2007 (1936).

Barnes, Djuna. *The Antiphon*. København & Los Angeles: Green Integer, 2000 (1958).

Barnes, Djuna. *Creatures in an Alphabet*. New York: Dial Press, 1982.

Barnes, Djuna. *Collected Poems*, eds. Phillip Herring and Osías Stutman. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 2005.

Berger, John. "Why Look At Animals." In *About Looking*. New York: Pantheon Books, 1980.

Bockting, Margaret. "Performers and the Erotic in Four Interviews by Djuna Barnes." *Centennial Review* 41 no.1 (1997): 183–95

Bombaci, Nancy. "'Well Of Course, I Used to be Absolutely Gorgeous, Dear:' The Female Interviewer as Subject/Object in Djuna Barnes's Journalism." *Criticism: A Quarterly For Literature and the Arts* 44 no.2 (2002): 161-85

Broeck, Helen Ten. "Mrs Vernon Castle's Bear Dance Thrills Debutantes, but Bear Tears Her Gown." *New York Press* February 7, 1915, section 4: 4.

Butler, Judith. *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity*, New York: Routledge, 1990

Castle, Vernon and Irene Castle. *Modern Dancing*. New York: Harper & Bros., 1914.

Castle, Irene (Mrs Vernon Castle). *My Husband*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1919.

Castle, Irene. *Castle in the Air, (as told to Bob and Wanda Duncan)*. Garden City NY: Doubleday & Company Inc, 1958.

Chuaduri, Una. "Animal Geographies, Zooësis and the Space of Modern Drama." *Modern Drama* 46, no.4 (2003): 646-62.

Cull, Laura. "From *Homo Performans* to Interspecies Collaboration." In *Performing Animality Performing Animality: Animals in Performance Practice*, eds Lourdes Orozco and Jennifer Parker-Starbuck, 19-36. Houndmills & New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2015.

Edwards, Erin. *The Modernist Corpse: Posthumanism and the Posthumous*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2018.

Eliot, Valerie and John Haffenden, eds. *Letters of T S Eliot 1923-1925 volume two*, New Haven: Yale University Press, 2012.

Evensen, Bruce J. "Journalism." In *A Companion to the Gilded Age and Progressive Era*, ed. Christopher McKnight Nichols and Nancy C. Unger, 178-89. Chichester: John Wiley & Sons, 2017.

George-Graves, Nadine. "'Just Like Being at the Zoo': Primitivity and Ragtime Dance." In *Ballroom, Boogie, Shimmy Sham, Shake: A Social and Popular Dance Reader*, ed. Julie Malnig, 55-71. Champaign, IL: University of Illinois Press, 2008.

Golden, Eve. *Vernon and Irene Castle's Ragtime Revolution*. Lexington: University Press of Kentucky, 2007.

Goody, Alex. "Spectacle, Technology and Performing Bodies: Djuna Barnes at Coney Island," *Modernist Cultures* 7, no.2 (2012): 205-230.

Goody, Alex. "Djuna Barnes on the Page." In *Shattered Objects: Djuna Barnes's Modernism*, ed. Elizabeth Pender and Cathryn Setz, 26-45. University Park: Pennsylvania University Press, 2019.

Green, Denise M. "The Best Known and Best Dressed Woman in America: Irene Castle and Silent Film Style" *Dress* 43, no.2, 2017, 77-98.

Hovanec, Cari. *Animal Subjects: Literature, Zoology, and British Modernism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2018.

Malnig, Julie. *Dancing Till Dawn: A Century of Exhibition Ballroom Dance*. New York & London: New York University Press, 1995.

Malnig, Julie. "Two-Stepping to Glory: Social Dance and the Rhetoric of Social Mobility." *Etnofoor* 10, no.1/2 (1997):128-150.

Merve, Ann Ommen van der. *The Ziegfeld Follies: A History in Song*, Lanham Maryland: Scarecrow Press, 2009.

Oliver, Sophie. "Djuna Barnes in a Material World: Fashion and Transatlantic Modernity in the 1910," *Literature Compass* (2014), 11: 346-366.

Ridinger Smorul, Kate. "Of Marionettes, Boxers, and Suffragettes: Djuna Barnes's Performative Journalism." *Journal of Modern Literature*, 39, no.1 (2015): 55-71.

Robinson, Danielle. "The Ugly Duckling: The Refinement of Ragtime Dancing and the Mass Production and Marketing of Modern Social Dance." *Dance Research: The Journal of the Society for Dance Research* 28, no.2 (Winter 2010): 179-199.

Robinson, Danielle. *Dance Moves: Dancing Race During the Ragtime and Jazz Eras*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015.

Rodgers, Ronald. "The Social Awakening and the News: A Progressive Era Movement's Influence on Journalism and Journalists' Conceptions of Their Roles." *Journalism History*, 46, no.2 (2020): 81-105.

Rohman, Carrie. *Stalking the Subject: Modernism and the Animal*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2009.

Rohman, Carrie. *Choreographies of the Living*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2018

Schechner, Richard. *Performance Studies: An Introduction*. London & New York: Routledge, 2013.

Slide, Anthony. *The Encyclopedia of Vaudeville*. Jackson: University Press of Mississippi, 2012.

Shukin, Nicole. *Animal Capital: Rendering Life in Biopolitical Times*. Minneapolis & London: University of Minnesota Press, 2009.

Sterns, Marshall and Jean. *Jazz Dance: The Story of American Vernacular*. New York: Schirmer Books, 1968.

Tünaydin, Pelin. "Pawing Through The History Of Bear Dancing in Europe." *Frühneuzeit-Info* 24 (October 2013): 51-60

Young, Catherine. "'A Very Good Act for an Unimportant Place': Animals, Ambivalence and Abuse in Big-Time Vaudeville." In *Performing Animality: Animals in Performance Practices*, eds Lourdes Orozco and Jennifer Parker-Starbuck, 77-96. Houndmills & New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2015.

Zimring, Rishona. *Social Dance and the Modernist Imagination in Interwar Britain*. London & New York: Routledge, 2013.

¹ "(The dance of) The Grizzly Bear" words by Irving Berlin, Music George Botsford, 1910.

² On the history of dancing bears see Pelin Tünaydin, "Pawing Through The History Of Bear Dancing in Europe," *Frühneuzeit-Info* 24 (October 2013): 51-60.

³ In their 1968 volume *Jazz Dance: The Story of American Vernacular* Dance Marshall and Jean Sterns propose that many rag dances originated in dance clubs and honky-tonks in the western and southern USA in the early 1900s before migrating to eastern cities (New York: Schirmer Books), 95-96; the movement of rag dances from west to east coast is discussed in H.E. Cooper "Rag on the Barbary Coast," *The Dance Magazine* (December 1927), 31, 60.

⁴ Danielle Robinson, *Dance Moves: Dancing Race During the Ragtime and Jazz Eras* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015), 6; see also Nadine George-Graves who gives a detailed account of the plantation animal dances that "occurred throughout slavery" (60) in "Just Like Being at the Zoo': Primitivity and Ragtime Dance," in *Ballroom, Boogie, Shimmy Sham, Shake: A Social and Popular Dance Reader*, ed. Julie Malnig (Champaign, IL: University of Illinois Press, 2008), 60. That Indigenous bear dances such as the Ute springtime Bear Dance existed in North America before settler colonialism is invisible in all histories of the "Grizzly Bear"; for detail of the Ute dance see Sally McBeth "'The Bear Is Our Protector': Metaphor and Mediation in the Northern Ute (Nuche) Bear Dance," in *Mediating Indianness*, ed. Cathy Covell Waegner (Michigan: Michigan State University Press, 2015), 213-229.

⁵ See for example "Welfare Inspector at Society Dance: Movement Begins to Bar 'Turkey Trot' and 'Grizzly Bear' from Fifth Avenue," *New York Times*, January 4, 1912, 1; "Philadelphia Bans The Trot: Grizzly Bear Also to be Eliminated from Society," *New York Times*, January 4, 1912, 9; "Bars 'Grizzly Bear' at Dance at Astor," *New York Times*, January 16, 1912, 13. Local newspapers in many other cities also recorded bans of the dance, see for e.g. "'Dago Frank' is Defying Police: Levee

Divekeeper Stages ‘Grizzly Bear’ Dance in Spite of Embargo,” *The Chicago Daily Tribune*, April 29, 1911, 3.

⁶ Nadine George-Graves provides a detailed consideration of “the importance of animality and primitivity in social dance during this period” in “Primitivity and Ragtime Dances” (56).

⁷ Frank G. Kane, “The City Newspaper Reporter,” in *The Better Newspaper: Addresses on News, Editorial, Advertising, Circulation and Printing Given at the Second Newspaper Institute at the University of Washington* January 15, 16 and 17, 1914; quoted in Ronald Rodgers, “The Social Awakening and the News: A Progressive Era Movement’s Influence on Journalism and Journalists’ Conceptions of Their Roles,” *Journalism History*, 46: 2 (2020): 93; Frank G. Kane, “The Newspaper and Politics,” in University of Washington and Washington Press Association, *The Washington Newspaper: A Publication Dedicated to the Study and Improvement of Journalism in Washington* (Seattle, WA: Department of Journalism, University of Washington, 1915) quoted in Rodgers, “The Social Awakening and the News”, 94,

⁸ Bruce J. Evensen, “Journalism” in *A Companion to the Gilded Age and Progressive Era*, ed. Christopher McKnight Nichols and Nancy C. Unger (Chichester: John Wiley & Sons, 2017), 186

⁹ Evensen, “Journalism,” 186.

¹⁰ As I have argued, animal proximities and “becomings-animal” proliferate in Barnes’s writing (Alex Goody, *Modernist Articulations: A Cultural Study of Djuna Barnes, Mina Loy and Gertrude Stein*, Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007, 164-73). Carrie Rohman’s *Stalking the Subject*, a key originating text for modernist animal studies, has a chapter on Barnes (Carrie Rohman, *Stalking the Subject: Modernism and the Animal*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2009), and earlier Bonnie Kime Scott explored “Barnes’s Beasts Turning Human” in *Refiguring Modernism Volume 2: Postmodern Feminist Readings of Woolf, West and Barnes* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1995, 71-122). For more on Barnes and animal studies see also Alex Goody, “Nonhuman Animals and Decorative Modernism in Djuna Barnes and Mina Loy,” *Women: A Cultural Review*, 32, no.1 (2021): 8–31; Andrew Kalaidjian, “The Black Sheep: Djuna Barnes’s Dark Pastoral,” in *Creatural Fictions: Human-Animal Relationships in Twentieth- and Twenty-First-Century Literature*, ed David Herman (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2016), 65–87; Karen Kaivola, “The ‘Beast Turning Human’: Constructions of the ‘Primitive’ in *Nightwood*”, *The Review of Contemporary Fiction* 13, no.3 (1993): 172–185; Molly Mann, “Queer Hunger: Human and Animal Bodies in Djuna Barnes’ *Nightwood*,” in *Veg(etari)an Arguments in Culture, History, and Practice*, eds Cristina Hanganu-Bresch and Kristin Kondrlik (Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan, 2021), 195-212; Rachel Potter, “*Nightwood*’s Humans,” in *Shattered Objects: Djuna Barnes’s Modernism*, eds Elizabeth Pender and Cathryn Setz (University Park: Pennsylvania University Press, 2019), 61–74.; see also Peter Adkins’s recent study that looks at Barnes within the frames of Anthropocene studies (*The Modernist Anthropocene: Nonhuman Life and Planetary Change in James Joyce, Virginia Woolf and Djuna Barnes*, Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2022).

¹¹ See sections on Barnes journalism in Tim Armstrong’s *Modernism, Technology, and the Body: A Cultural History* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1998); Katherine Biers, “Djuna Barnes Makes a Speciality of Crime: Violence and the Visual in Her Early Journalism,” in *Women’s Experience of Modernity: 1875-1945*, eds Ann L. Ardis and Leslie W. Lewis (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2003), 237-53 and the sections on Barnes’s journalism in Katherine Biers, *Virtual Modernism: Writing and Technology in the Progressive Era* (Minneapolis and London: University of Minnesota Press, 2013); Margaret Bockting, “Performers and the Erotic in Four Interviews by Djuna Barnes,” *Centennial Review* 41 no.1 (1997): 183– 95; Nancy Bombaci, “‘Well Of Course, I Used to be Absolutely Gorgeous, Dear’: The Female Interviewer as Subject/Object in Djuna Barnes’s Journalism,” *Criticism: A Quarterly For Literature and the Arts* 44 no.2 (2002): 161-85; Justin D. Edwards, “‘Why Go Abroad?’: Djuna Barnes and the Urban Travel Narrative,” *Journal of Urban History* 29, no.1 (2002): 6–24; Alex Goody, “Spectacle, Technology and Performing Bodies: Djuna Barnes at Coney Island,” *Modernist Cultures* 7, no.2 (2012): 205-230; Barbara Green, “Spectacular Confessions: ‘How it Feels to be Forcibly Fed’,” *The Review of Contemporary Fiction* 13, no.3 (Fall 1993): 70– 88; Thomas Heise, “Degenerate Sex and the City: Djuna Barnes’s Urban Underworld,” *Twentieth Century Literature* 55, no.3 (2009): 287–321; Nancy J. Levine, “‘Bringing Milkshakes to Bulldogs’: The Early Journalism of Djuna Barnes” in *Silence and Power: A Reevaluation of Djuna Barnes*, ed. Mary Lynn Broe (Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press,

1991): 27-34; Rebecca Loncraine, “Voix-de-Ville: Djuna Barnes’s Stunt Journalism, Harry Houdini and the Birth of Cinema,” *Women: A Cultural Review* 19, no.2 (2008): 156-71; Kate Ridinger Smorul, “Of Marionettes, Boxers, and Suffragettes: Djuna Barnes’s Performative Journalism,” *Journal of Modern Literature*, 39, no.1 (2015): 55-71; Laura Winkiel, “Circuses and Spectacles: Public Culture in *Nightwood*,” *Journal of Modern Literature* 21, no.1 (1997): 7-28; and sections on Barnes in Jean Marie Lutes, *Front Page Girls: Women Journalists in American Culture and Fiction, 1880-1930* (Ithaca NY: Cornell University Press, 2006).

¹² Sophie Oliver, “Djuna Barnes in a Material World: Fashion and Transatlantic Modernity in the 1910,” *Literature Compass* (2014), 11, 350.

¹³ Alex Goody, “Djuna Barnes on the Page,” in *Shattered Objects: Djuna Barnes’s Modernism*, ed. Elizabeth Pender and Cathryn Setz (University Park: Pennsylvania University Press, 2019), 28

¹⁴ Carrie Rohman, *Choreographies of the Living* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2018), 13:

Rohman’s study has had a significant impact on my thinking in this article.

¹⁵ Rohman, *Choreographies of the Living*, 14.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*

¹⁷ “My Sisters and I at a New York Prize-Fight; Following the Example of Their French and English Cousins, New York Women Have Begun to Flock to the Ringside—Here Is an Impressionistic Picture of a Boxing Bout before a Mixed Audience by a Woman Who Had Never See One Before,” 23 August, 1914, 6; “How It Feels to Be Forcibly Fed,” 6 September, 1914, 5, 17; “The Girl and the Gorilla; Dinah at the Bronx Zoo, a Weird Little Forty-five-Pound Bunch of Femininity—Not Yet Fully-Grown, but Converses Intelligently in Language of the Primates,” 18 October, 1914, 9; “My Adventures Being Rescued; Demonstrating, as Chief Larkin Says, that New Fangled Life-Saving Devices Are Mostly Impracticable, So It’s Safer to Stick to the Old Methods of ‘the Rope, the Fireman and the Girl’,” 15 November, 1914, 6.

¹⁸ Barnes published in *All-Story Weekly* and *Munsey’s Magazine*: she also wrote for the *New York Sun* newspaper in 1918 (Munsey had purchased the *New York Sun* in 1916).

¹⁹ Biers, *Virtual Modernism*, 140; Edwards “Why Go Abroad,” 21

²⁰ “Come into the Roof-Garden Maud,” *New York Press*, June 14, 1914, section 6, 1; “The Terrible Peacock,” *All-Story Cavalier Weekly*, 37, no.4, October 24, 1914, 780-784; “Flo Zigfeld Says He Selects His Chorus Girls by Looking at Their Feet and Hands; Never Listens to Their Voices, Because Good Singers Seldom Have Beautiful Faces,” *New York Press* May 24, 1914, section 5, 1; “Recruiting for Métachorie: Mme. Valentine de Saint-Point Talks of Her Church of Music,” *New York Morning Telegraph Sunday Magazine*, April 15, 1917, 4; “Great Success Has Made Joan Sawyer Timid,” *New York Press*, July 24, 1914, section 5, 7; “Vaudeville,” *All-Story Cavalier Weekly*, April 24, 1915, 375; reprinted in *Vanity Fair* May 1923, 67. For a full list of Barnes’s New York journalism pieces on dance see Alex Goody, “Spectacle, Technology and Performing Bodies;” in that article I discuss Barnes’s engagement with a range of dance forms through the frames of technology and the spectacle. See also Alex Goody *Modernist Poetry, Gender and Leisure Technologies* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2019), 167-76.

²¹ Bocking, “Performers and the Erotic,” 189.

²² Djuna Barnes, “The Wild Aguglia and Her Monkeys,” *New York Press*, December 28, 1913, section 5, 2.

²³ *Ibid.*

²⁴ Bombaci, “The Female Interviewer,” 174.

²⁵ Barnes, “The Wild Aguglia,” 2.

²⁶ Djuna Barnes, “You Can Tango—a Little—At Arcadia Dance Hall,” *Brooklyn Daily Eagle*, June 29, 1913, section 2, 22.

²⁷ Djuna Barnes, “The Tingling, Tangling Tango as ‘Tis Tripped at Coney Isle,” *Brooklyn Daily Eagle*, August 31, 1913, magazine section: 7.

²⁸ Anon, “How to Dance at the Arcadia,” *Brooklyn Daily Eagle*, June 29, 1913, section 2, 22,

²⁹ See Nadine George-Graves on the ubiquity of the “‘loaded terms of ‘graceful’ and ‘dignified’” used to distinguish “whitened” ragtime dancing from “so-called less-civilized forms” and “movement styles [. . .] considered lascivious because they were looser limbed” (“Primitivity and Ragtime Dance,” 64)

- ³⁰ Anthony Slide, *The Encyclopedia of Vaudeville* (Jackson: University Press of Mississippi, 2012), 63.
- ³¹ Quoted in Ann Ommen van der Merve, *The Ziegfeld Follies: A History in Song* (Lanham Maryland: Scarecrow Press, 2009), 700.
- ³² Eliot is likely to have encountered the Grizzly Bear dance whilst a student at Harvard between 1911 and 1914 – a January 1912 report in the *New York Times*, for example, demonstrates the prevalence of the dance at Yale (Anon, “Ban ‘Grizzly Bear’ at Yale,” *New York Times* January 21 1912, 12).
- ³³ Valerie Eliot and John Haffenden, eds. *Letters of T S Eliot 1923-1925 volume two* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2012), 543. The “Chicken Strut” was not a popular ragtime dance; Eliot here may well be misremembering the name of the “Turkey Trot.”
- ³⁴ Rishona Zimring, *Social Dance and the Modernist Imagination in Interwar Britain* (London & New York: Routledge, 2013), 11.
- ³⁵ Cari Hovanec, *Animal Subjects: Literature, Zoology, and British Modernism* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2018), 24.
- ³⁶ “Fires Drive Out Grizzlies,” *New York Times*, Monday July 17, 1911, 6.
- ³⁷ Henry Siegel Store, Full page advertisement, *New York Evening World*, Thursday November 21, 1912, 9; B. Altman & Co, Advertisement, *The New York Sun*, November 17, 1912, 4.
- ³⁸ John Berger, “Why Look At Animals,” in *About Looking* (New York: Pantheon Books, 1980), 21, 26
- ³⁹ Berger, “Why Look At Animals,” 25
- ⁴⁰ Catherine Young, “‘A Very Good Act for an Unimportant Place’: Animals. Ambivalence and Abuse in Big-Time Vaudeville,” in *Performing Animality: Animals in Performance Practices*, eds Lourdes Orozco and Jennifer Parker-Starbuck, 77-96 (Houndmills & New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2015), 78.
- ⁴¹ Nicole Shukin, *Animal Capital: Rendering Life in Biopolitical Times* (Minneapolis & London: University of Minnesota Press, 2009), 7.
- ⁴² Shukin, *Animal Capital*, 3.
- ⁴³ Shukin, *Animal Capital*, 4.
- ⁴⁴ See “The Monarch Bear,” <http://www.monarchbear.org/monarch/index.html> [accessed June 7, 2021]; see also <https://www.calacademy.org/explore-science/monarch-the-grizzly-bear>.
- ⁴⁵ Richard Schechner, *Performance Studies: An Introduction* (London & New York: Routledge, 2013), 2
- ⁴⁶ Laura Cull, “From *Homo Performans* to Interspecies Collaboration,” in *Performing Animality: Animals in Performance Practice*, eds Lourdes Orozco and Jennifer Parker-Starbuck, 19-36 (Houndmills & New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2015), 21.
- ⁴⁷ Cull, “From *Homo Performans*,” 25.
- ⁴⁸ Zooësis is Una Chuaduri’s coining to describe the discourse of species in contemporary culture and performance (Una Chuaduri, “Animal Geographies, Zooësis and the Space of Modern Drama,” *Modern Drama* 46 no.4 (2003): 646-62.)
- ⁴⁹ This is the key term for Kate Ridinger Smorul in her argument about “Djuna Barnes’s Performative Journalism” (“Of Marionettes, Boxers, and Suffragettes”).
- ⁵⁰ Barnes, “Wild Aguglia,” 2.
- ⁵¹ Barnes, “The Girl and the Gorilla,” 9
- ⁵² Ibid.
- ⁵³ My deployment of the term *anthroperformance* differs from its use in decolonial, feminist anthropology (see Faye Harrison “‘Three Women, One Struggle:’ Anthropology, Performance and Pedagogy”, *Transforming Anthropology* 1, no.1 [1990]: 1-9). Anthroperformance, as I use it, indicates the iterative performativity of the human, where “human” is shored up as a stable category through the configuration of bodies into discrete (human/nonhuman) categories that are enacted, rather than essential. Thus, to (mis)quote Judith Butler “the abiding [human] self will then be shown to be structured by repeated acts that seek to approximate the ideal of a substantial ground of identity, but which, in their occasional *discontinuity*, reveal the temporal and contingent groundlessness of this ‘ground’” (Judith Butler, *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity*, New York: Routledge, 1990, 141).

- ⁵⁴ Julie Malnig, *Dancing Till Dawn: A Century of Exhibition Ballroom Dance* (New York & London: New York University Press, 1995), 2.
- ⁵⁵ Malnig, *Dancing Till Dawn*, 7, 4.
- ⁵⁶ Danielle Robinson, "The Ugly Duckling: The Refinement of Ragtime Dancing and the Mass Production and Marketing of Modern Social Dance," *Dance Research: The Journal of the Society for Dance Research* 28, no.2 (Winter 2010): 182, 182, 183.
- ⁵⁷ See fn6 above.
- ⁵⁸ "Fear 'Grizzly Bear' Face," *New York Press*, Wednesday June 12, 1912, section 2, 5.
- ⁵⁹ Ibid.
- ⁶⁰ "To Beat the Turkey Trot," *New York Times*, October 11, 1912, 9.
- ⁶¹ "Plans Model Dance Hall," *New York Times*, October 1, 1912, 9.
- ⁶² Djuna Barnes, "You Can Tango—a Little—At Arcadia Dance Hall," *Brooklyn Daily Eagle*, June 29, 1913, section 2, 22.
- ⁶³ "Welfare Inspector at Society Dance: Movement Begins to Bar 'Turkey Trot' and 'Grizzly Bear' from Fifth Avenue," *New York Times*, January 4, 1912, 1; "Turkey Trot Lures Rubinstein Club," *New York Times*, January 24, 1912, 11.
- ⁶⁴ It is important to acknowledge (as Danielle Robinson does) that cross-cultural borrowing was bidirectional in the development of modern social dance in America, that "the appropriation went in both directions during this period, although with very different political implications" and thus "[Black] Dancers traded on the white racial signification of the dances [of European American ballroom] to claim an elevated class status within black communities while also inserting moments of African American movement to make the dancing their own" (Robinson, *Modern Moves*, 8, 28; see also Chapter 3)
- ⁶⁵ Barnes interviewed Vernon and Irene Castle for the *New York Press* in early 1914, see Djuna Barnes, "Yes, the Vernon Castles Really Have a Home and They Occasionally Tango Past It," *New York Press*, January 18, 1914, section 5, 3.
- ⁶⁶ Irene Castle, Irene (Mrs Vernon Castle), *My Husband* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1919), 36.
- ⁶⁷ That the link between the Castles and the "Grizzly Bear" endured is illustrated in a *New York Press* article from May 1914: in an account of a "circus" fundraising event at Barnard College one of the animal entertainments is given as two "trained bears who answered to the names of Joan Sawyer and Vernon Castle" ("Barnard Girls in Circus Day Fun" *New York Press* May 10, 1914, section 1, 2). Joan Sawyer was a rival to Irene Castle as a popular exhibition dancer; she originated the "Aeroplane Waltz" in 1909 and was interviewed by Barnes in 1914.
- ⁶⁸ Irene Castle moved on to a quite successful silent film career starring in nineteen films between 1915 and 1923.
- ⁶⁹ Irene Castle recounts how she bobbed her hair whilst still at school: however, it is the hair cut she had, for convenience, before undergoing an appendectomy in early 1914 that began the craze for the Castle Bob (see Eve Golden, *Vernon and Irene Castle's Ragtime Revolution*, Lexington: University Press of Kentucky, 2007, 26-27, 65, 113; see also Denise N. Green, "The Best Known and Best Dressed Woman in America," *Dress* 43, no.2 (2017): 80-81).
- ⁷⁰ Julie Malnig, "Two-Stepping to Glory: Social Dance and the Rhetoric of Social Mobility," *Etnofoor* 10 no. 1/2 (1997), 138.
- ⁷¹ For an example of the "sanitized" Grizzly Bear see the detailed instructions, accompanied by illustrations, given in "Mlle. Gaby Deslys Tells How To Dance the 'Grizzly Bear,'" *The Buffalo Enquirer*, 26 June, 1912, 9.
- ⁷² Danielle Robinson, "The Ugly Duckling: The Refinement of Ragtime Dancing and the Mass Production and Marketing of Modern Social Dance," *Dance Research: The Journal of the Society for Dance Research* 28, no.2 (Winter 2010), 192.
- ⁷³ Robinson, "The Ugly Duckling," 180, 189.
- ⁷⁴ Golden, *Vernon and Irene Castle*, 70.
- ⁷⁵ "Concert by Negro Orchestra," *New York Evening Post* April 6, 1914, 7.
- ⁷⁶ Helen Ten Broeck, "Mrs Vernon Castle's Bear Dance Thrills Debutantes, but Bear Tears Her Gown," February 7, 1915, section 4, 4.

-
- ⁷⁷ Broeck, “Mrs Vernon Castle’s Bear Dance,” 4
- ⁷⁸ Ibid.
- ⁷⁹ Ibid.
- ⁸⁰ Irene Castle, *Castles in the Air, (as told to Bob and Wanda Duncan)*, (Garden City NY: Doubleday & Company Inc, 1958), 101.
- ⁸¹ Castle, *Castles in the Air*, 102-105.
- ⁸² Castle, *Castles in the Air*, 102.
- ⁸³ See “Midwinter Circus at the Hippodrome,” *New York Times*, January 24, 1915, section C, 15; “This Week At The Theatres,” *Brooklyn Daily Standard Union*, February 28, 1915, 7; “New York Hippodrome Is Converted Into Mammoth Circus Tent,” *Ithaca Daily News*, March 11, 1915, 9.
- ⁸⁴ Golden, *Vernon and Irene Castle*, 130.
- ⁸⁵ Castle, *Castles in the Air*, 102-103.
- ⁸⁶ Djuna Barnes, “Djuna Barnes Probes the Souls of the Jungle Folk at the Hippodrome Circus,” *New York Press*, February 14, 1915, section 4, 2
- ⁸⁷ Ibid.
- ⁸⁸ Ibid.
- ⁸⁹ Ibid.
- ⁹⁰ Ibid.
- ⁹¹ Winkiel, “Circuses and Spectacles,” 18.
- ⁹² Rohman describes the “visceral nature of dance as it foregrounds the somatic and ‘inhuman’ in a uniquely intensified manner,” and I have drawn on her statement that dance “affords an especially creatural mode of becoming” to think through the *becomings of dance* throughout this article (*Choreographies of the Living*, 14).
- ⁹³ Broeck, “Mrs Vernon Castle’s Bear Dance,” 4
- ⁹⁴ Barnes, “Hippodrome Circus,” 2.
- ⁹⁵ Djuna Barnes, *Nightwood* (1936) (London: Faber and Faber, 2007), 33, 31.
- ⁹⁶ Erin Edwards, *The Modernist Corpse: Posthumanism and the Posthumous* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2018), 171; Cull, “From *Homo Performans*,” 25.
- ⁹⁷ Djuna Barnes, *The Antiphon* (1958) (København & Los Angeles: Green Integer, 2000), 136.
- ⁹⁸ Djuna Barnes, “There Should Be Gardens” (c.1974), in *Collected Poems*, eds. Phillip Herring and Osías Stutman (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 2005), 187.
- ⁹⁹ Djuna Barnes, *Creatures in an Alphabet* (New York: Dial Press, 1982), np.